

REMARKS

This reply is responsive to the Office Action mailed on June 15, 2006. Claims 1-17 and 28-34 are pending in the application. Claims 18-27 are withdrawn from consideration. Reconsideration in light of the following remarks is requested.

I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-8, 11, and 14-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Cameron (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0028206, published February 3, 2005). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Cameron discloses a computer software application for end-to-end management of the delivery of IP-configured integrated multimedia signals (e.g., TV, video, Website, etc.), on an interactive basis, to a subscriber device (being a personal computer (PC) and monitor coupled thereto or television/set-top box combination). The system manager comprises an interactive program guide (IPG) component configured for providing to the subscriber an interactive program guide (IPG) permitting selection of the multimedia signals by the subscriber and a subscriber device component associated with the subscriber device and configured for receiving instructions from the subscriber. The subscriber device includes a decoder configured for converting the selected IP multicast format signals into a format for display on PC monitor or television. A PC component is configured for displaying the converted multimedia signals on the PC monitor in the form of a player window and for displaying a remote controller GUI on the monitor, the remote controller GUI being a model of a hand-held remote controller and controllable by the subscriber for controlling the selection of signals from the IPG. The interactive

program guide provides drop down box selection and scroll bar GUI features. (Cameron, Abstract)

The Examiner's attention is directed to the fact that Cameron fails to disclose "a plurality of virtual streams", as recited in independent claim 1.

The present invention, in one embodiment, discloses a carousel file server at a headend of a broadband network periodically and repeatedly streams application data files over in-band or out-of-band delivery paths (or a combination of both) to client applications running on a population of set-top terminals in a network. The carousel server streams multiple virtual streams carrying multicast addresses into a single downstream service (i.e., a PID stream) within a stream set using standard MPEG-2 transport protocols. The virtual streaming implemented by the multicast addressing provides another level of filtering so that set-top terminals in the network may access application data files beyond that enabled by PID filtering. The application data files in the virtual file system are flexibly partitioned among the virtual streams (or across the stream set) to thereby create a virtual file system. (Application, Abstract)

In contrast, Cameron is completely devoid of the concept of a virtual stream. Since Cameron does not teach the use of a virtual stream, Cameron cannot anticipate "creating a plurality of virtual streams in a single downstream service within a stream set where the virtual streams carry multicast addresses associated with the selected set-top terminals in the cable network", as recited in independent claim 1.

Therefore in view of the above, independent claim 1 is patentable over Cameron. As such, claims 2-8, 11, and 14-17 are patentable at least by virtue of depending from their respective base claims. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

A. Cameron in view of Takahashi

Claims 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Cameron in view of Takahashi (U.S. Patent No. 6,633,592, issued October 14, 2003). Applicants respectfully disagree.

As argued above in Section I., Cameron fails to disclose “a plurality of virtual streams”. The Examiner concedes that Cameron fails to teach the MPEG-2 includes PAT or PMT. In order to cure the Examiner’s perceived deficiency of Cameron, the Examiner cites Takahashi.

Takahashi discloses that a picture is treated as an aggregate of plural objects, and the picture data is processed on an object-oriented basis to be multiplexed. A method of multiplexing data comprises the steps of (1) dividing the picture into a plurality of master objects, and identifying themselves as the master objects; (2) dividing the identified master object into smaller slave objects upon request, and identifying themselves as the slave objects, whereby a hierarchy is formed; (3) packetizing one of the identified master object and the identified slave object into a packet, and assigning a packet number to the packet, and (4) adding the hierarchical details as hierarchical information to the multiplexed data. In addition to this method of multiplexing data, a reproducing method of data multiplexed through this method of multiplexing data, and a, data reproducing apparatus using the reproducing method are provided by the present invention.

(Takahashi, Abstract)

As stated above, Cameron fails to disclose “a plurality of virtual streams”.

Cameron in combination with Takahashi fails to cure this deficiency.

As such, Applicant submits that claims 9 and 10, are patentable in view of the above arguments and at least by virtue of depending from their respective base claims.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

B. Cameron in view of Rosen

Claims 12 and 28 stand rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Cameron in view of Rosen (U.S. Patent No. 5,745,767, issued April 28, 1998). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As argued above in Section I., Cameron fails to disclose “a plurality of virtual streams”. Cameron likewise also fails to disclose “a plurality of virtual data streams or a stream set”, as recited in independent claim 28. The Examiner concedes that Cameron fails to teach “wherein the API includes wrapper functions” or “providing a plurality of wrapped code to assemble a set of related application data files from a plurality of virtual data streams or a stream set; providing one or more wrapper functions to a client application running on the set-top terminal to access the wrapped code; and executing a wrapped code in response to a wrapper function call placed by the client application”. (See Office Action, pages 9 and 10) In order to cure the Examiner’s perceived deficiency of Cameron, the Examiner cites Rosen.

Rosen discloses a method and system for testing the interoperability of application programs. The interoperability testing system uses an application-independent test script and application-specific command scripts to test the interoperability of

application programs. An application-independent test script contains a series of high-level application-independent commands that are to be performed to test the application programs. Each application program to be tested has a corresponding application-specific command script. An application-specific command script contains an implementation of each high-level command for the corresponding application program. To test application programs, the interoperability testing system executes an application-independent test script by reading each high-level command from the test script, retrieving the implementation of that high-level command for the application program that is to perform that command, and executing that implementation. (Rosen, Abstract)

As stated above, Cameron fails to disclose “a plurality of virtual streams” or “a plurality of virtual data streams or a stream set”, as recited in Applicants independent claims 1 and 28. Cameron in combination with Rosen fails to cure this deficiency.

As such, Applicant submits that claims 12 and 28, are patentable in view of the above arguments and at least by virtue of depending from their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

C. Cameron and Rosen in view of Klein

Claims 13 and 29-34 stand rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Cameron and Rosen in view of Klein (U.S. Patent No. 6,185,590, issued February 6, 2001). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As argued above in Section II. B., Cameron and Rosen fail to disclose “a plurality of virtual streams” or “a plurality of virtual data streams or a stream set”, as recited in Applicants independent claims 1 and 28. The Examiner concedes that Cameron and

Rosen fail to teach “wrapper functions that include a synchronous function-call and response” and “an asynchronous response to a function-call is implemented for a selected function”. In order to cure the Examiner’s perceived deficiency of Cameron and Rosen, the Examiner cites Klein.

Klein discloses an image viewer process views at least one document image including an electronic document image, and performs viewing operations to the electronic document image. The process includes the step of selecting, by the user, one of a plurality of image viewing perspectives. Each of the plurality of image viewing perspectives provide the user the capability of viewing the document image in accordance with a different predefined user perspective. The process also includes the steps of selecting, by the user, using the image viewer process the document image to be viewed, and retrieving, by the image viewer process, the document image. The process also includes the step of displaying, by the image viewer process, the selected document image in accordance with an image viewing perspective selected by the user. (Klein, Abstract)

As stated above, Cameron and Rosen fail to disclose “a plurality of virtual streams” or “a plurality of virtual data streams or a stream set”. Cameron and Rosen in combination with Klein fails to cure this deficiency.

As such, Applicant submits that claims 13 and 29-34, are patentable in view of the above arguments and at least by virtue of depending from their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

III. Election of Claims

This Response confirms the election of claims 1-17 and 28-34 in response to the Restriction requirement. Claims 18-27 are hereby withdrawn from consideration.

Conclusion

Having fully responded to the Office action, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Should any issues arise that prevent early allowance of the above application, the Examiner is invited contact the undersigned to resolve such issues.

To the extent an extension of time is needed for consideration of this response, Applicants hereby request such extension and, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account number 502117 for any fees associated therewith.

Date: 3/28/2007

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Thomas Bethea, Jr./
Thomas Bethea, Jr.
Reg. No.: 53,987

Motorola Connected Home Solutions
101 Tournament Drive
Horsham, PA 19044
(215) 323-1850